

to anyone who knows the story. F.'s reply to my proposal is 'μάντιν οὐτινα ψέγων Aesch.' Alike as controversy and as manners, this is no more than the equivalent of 'You're another' or 'Go on!' May I express the hope that someone will undertake the explanation of μάντιν οὐτινα ψέγων, and thereby discover one by one the numerous difficulties which this involves? If he is able to meet them I will capitulate.

You can place a text before a scholar, but you cannot make him read. In C.R. L 51-4 I did not point out that my ἐγώ as last word of line 7 is antithetic to βροτοῖς the last word of 5, because it seemed inconceivable that anyone should fail to note as much; I thought it sufficient to include this implication in the request that the reader would 'in one detail after another contrast the effortless balance and sustained articulacy' of the revised text 'with the flounderings of the incipient masterpiece as represented by the tradition.' But, as F. has said, mine is 'an amazing optimism'; I expect scholars to read what I have written before plunging into criticism of my views. In Y.W. 1936 p. 5 Professor Dobson compares this ἐγώ, not as is customary to other examples in literature, but to a pancake. In the *Antigone* of Sophocles alone there are (not reckoning 1211 ὁ τάλας ἐγώ) seventeen examples of ἐγώ as last word of the trimeter; five (655, 668, 886, 1092, 1166) have neither antithesis nor emphasis and must therefore seem to the Professor of Greek at Bristol 'as flat as a pancake'; one, 552, has emphasis but hardly antithesis; while no less than eleven are, very naturally, just like mine, both emphatic and antithetic; they are 39, 71, 85, 319, 390, 547, 900, 913, 1014,

1042, 1099. As for the *Agamemnon*, an example with both emphasis and antithesis occurs in this very speech at 38; otherwise, note 930 and 1433. Yet sure enough, next comes Professor Schlesinger and in *Amer. J. Phil.* LVIII p. 252 asserts that 'ἐγώ is otiose.' I cannot doubt that both these scholars, having jumped successfully at a large part of my meaning, assume for this reason that they have seen it all. Here again F., although he takes greater space in C.R. LI 60 to quote (without discussing) my 7-12 than I took in my original exposition, *ibid.* L 51, does not allow himself room to include the preceding two lines, which are essential to my meaning.

But even apart from its relation to βροτοῖς, ἐγώ in my text acquires a force which must be obvious to any good Grecian through its juxtaposition to καινὸν; and this force is intensified by the *enjambement* ἐγώ | καινὸν. I therefore now, after these additional arguments, reassert my claim that ἐγώ is the best conceivable, and the only perfect, word for this position. To reply that it is not in the MSS. is irrelevant to that claim.

I must allow myself one more instance to show how contemporary Aeschyleans know their Aeschylus. Professor Schlesinger criticizes my stage direction after 1371, 'iacet in lauacro argenteo Agamemnonis corpus'; he 'cannot believe' that Clytemnestra 'brought the plumbing with her.' However legitimate may be his merriment over this presentation of a corpse in a warm bath, the offender is not I but the poet; see 1539 f.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

*University of Liverpool.*

#### THE MANUSCRIPT S OF HERODOTUS.

ONE of the four MSS. which form the 'Roman' class d of Herodotus is S (formerly s), Emmanuel College Ms. no. 30, formerly known as *Sancroftianus* or *Archiepiscopalis* because it came to the College in 1691 from William Sancroft archbishop of Canterbury. There has been much difference of opinion about the date of this Ms. The earlier collators, Gale, Askew and Gaisford, are silent; Blakesley

ascribed it to the 12th century; and editors since then have agreed to put it in the 14th century, with which Hude, who examined S himself, concurs. On the other hand, M. R. James, in his catalogue of the Emmanuel College MSS., chose the 15th-16th centuries. But in fact S can be dated within a decade or so.

The scribe's hand is that of Γεώργιος ἀπατήρ Κρῆς, who wrote and signed *Marcianus* 198 (Vogel-Gardthausen *Griechische Schreiber*, p.

78<sup>1</sup>), a note by whom in *Parisinus gr.* 1908 (A.D. 1441) is reproduced in S. P. Lambros 'Αργυροπούλεα' 1909, p. 13, though there wrongly ascribed to J. Argyropoulos. Now George the Cretan also wrote N of Thucydides in the Cambridge University Library (Nn 3-18). The Herodotus and the Thucydides are twin books, written on the same paper, in the same ink, originally (before re-binding) of the same size and even now 220×131 mm. and 211×135 mm. respectively, having both 29 lines to a page, and in many other respects identical.<sup>2</sup> George never, so far as I know, dated a Ms. But since N of Thucydides was itself copied in 1469 (V, *Marcianus* 364) by Plousiadinos and was corrected by George himself from Z, *Marcianus cl. 7 cod. 5*, which is in the hand of Palla Strozzi, who died in 1462, we cannot be far wrong in dating both Herodotus S and Thucydides N to the middle years of the fifteenth century.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> V.-G. ignorantly treat *ἀπατήπ*, which means 'priest', as a proper name. See also Lobel, *Greek MSS. of Aristotle's Poetics*, 1933, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> The identity of hand was already observed by R. Shilleto (Thucydides I p. vi) in 1871; and since N has never been thought anything but 15th-century, it is surprising that the implications of the identification were overlooked.

### PLATO, *MENO* 99 E.

(Meno) καί τοις ίσως Ἀνυτος δέδε σοι ἀχθεται λέγοντι.  
(Socr.) Οὐδέν μέλει ἔμοιγε. τούτῳ μέν, ω Μένων,  
καὶ αὖθις διαλεξμεθα, κτλ.

I HAD suspected that something was wrong with this passage before I discovered that Wilamowitz, and he only, has a note on it. He would delete οὐδέν μέλει ἔμοιγε as 'einen groben Zusatz' because it not only lacks proper connexion with the clause following but also is out of tune with it in its rude bluntness. Unfortunately W. suggests no reason for the interpolation, nor is it easy to discover one. And that, perhaps, is why he characteristically describes his athetesis as one 'die man mir nicht glauben wird, aber ich kann mir nicht helfen und bin zuversichtlich.' I, too, am confident that the words in question do not harmonize with the context and are not in the right Socratic manner; but I would adopt a less heroic remedy than W. The trouble is that the words have been assigned to the wrong speaker (Socrates), and they should be restored to Anytus. When Meno says κατραι . . . λέγοντι he turns from Socrates and 'casts a sly glance' at Anytus, who thereupon bursts out with his rude 'I don't care a hang,' which is thus interpolated between Meno's remark and Socrates' mild τούτῳ μέν, κτλ. For a similar confusion of speakers see *Meno* 78C, D; *Gorg.* 497A; and for the tone of the phrase as proper to an opponent of Socrates compare the οὐδέ γέ με μέλει οὐδέν ὅν σὺ λέγεις of Callicles in *Gorg.* 505C.

R. G. BURY.

Cambridge.

## REVIEWS

### THE AGAMEMNON AND THE BACCHAE IN ENGLISH VERSE.

The *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, translated by Louis MACNEICE. Pp. 71. London: Faber and Faber, 1936. Cloth, 5s.

The *Bacchae* of Euripides, translated by Francis A. EVELYN. Pp. 60. London: Heath Cranton, 1936. Paper, 1s. 6d.

MR. MACNEICE'S work is described on the dust-cover as the first 'contemporary' translation of the play by a poet, and if 'contemporary' means modern, it is at first sight modern enough, for the metre, though recognizable as verse, does not conform to any fixed scheme either in the dialogue or in the lyrics, and the diction admits much that is not conventionally poetic. But under this modern covering further inspection reveals a translation unusually faithful and honest. The translator does not

modernize the thought of Aeschylus, but renders it as closely as he can, even to the point of preserving his boldest figures of speech. The result is an interesting translation which grows more impressive as one reads. We learn from the preface that it is intended primarily for the stage, and this explains certain characteristics. The translator has been studious to preserve the rhythm and order of natural speech, and in diction he has avoided what he calls the 'liturgical' flavour of Aeschylus. He may be right, but his methods involve the difficulty that in this more natural setting the Aeschylean figures of speech, which he preserves, stand out the more aggressively, and it will be difficult to carry them off. May he find actors capable of so doing, for it is a gallant attempt. Such